DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 240 113 SP 023 820

AUTHOR Zeichner, Kenneth M.; Tabachnick, B. Robert
TITLE Teacher Perspectives in the Face of Institutional Press.
INSTITUTION Wisconsin Center for Education Research, Madison.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Apr 83
GRANT NIE-G-81-0009
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Canada, April 11-15, 1983). For related document, see SP 023 819.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adjustment (to Environment); *Attitude Change; *Beginning Teachers; Elementary Education; Individual Characteristics; Institutional Characteristics; Personality Traits; Reference Groups; *Socialization; Student Teaching; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Orientation; Teacher Role; Teaching Experience

ABSTRACT

A longitudinal study of four beginning teachers examined the process of socialization during the induction period and the extent to which behavioral conformity to institutional norms reflected inner value commitments and perspectives. During their student teaching experience, the subjects participated in a study which measured their perspectives on the nature of knowledge and function of curriculum, the teacher's role, teacher-pupil relationships, and student diversity. Placed in different settings in their first year of teaching, the subjects were observed and interviewed to monitor their continuing development of teacher perspectives. Of particular interest was the degree to which each teacher felt free to employ initiative and independent judgment, and the extent to which each felt it necessary to conform to expectations of others with respect to what to teach. how to teach, and how to manage the classroom. It was concluded that, despite differing institutional contexts during student teaching and the first year, beginning teachers, under some conditions, maintained a perspective which was in conflict with the dominant institutional cultures in their schools. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED240113

TEACHER PERSPECTIVES IN THE FACE OF INSTITUTIONAL PRESS

Kenneth M. Zeichner and B. Robert Tabachnick

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada, April, 1983

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Rossmiller

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- ☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

The research reported in this paper was funded by the Wisconsin Center for Education Research which is supported in part by a grant from the National Institute of Education (Grant No. NIE-G-81-0009). The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the National Institute of Education.

SP023 820

TEACHER PERSPECTIVES IN THE FACE OF INSTITUTIONAL PRESS

The Problem

It is conventional to think of beginning teachers as vulnerable and unformed. They are expected to be unable to resist pressures to conform to institutional norms for teacher behavior. Willingly or unwillingly, beginning teachers are seen to be cajoled and pushed into shapes acceptable within their schools.

Hanson and Herrington (1976, pp. 61-62), in their study of probationary teachers in England, conclude:

> The only way apparently open to probationers was to conform to the conventional wisdom and recipe knowledge of those around them . . . . What teachers are doing is learned in school, and if in college there is some consideration of what teachers should be doing, it is not sustained.

Despite the existence of much empirical evidence which would support this view and which demonstrates the vulnerability of first-year teachers to the press of institutional forces, studies also exist which demonstrate a resilience and firmness of beginning teachers under pressures to change.

On the one hand, it has been shown in studies of both elementary and secondary teachers in several countries that beginning teachers experience statistically significant shifting in many kinds of attitudes during their first year. For example, beginning teachers have been shown to shift in an authoritarian direction in their attitudes toward pupils as measured by the MTAI (e.g., Day, 1959; Ligana, 1970); to shift their attitudes related to autonomy in the teacher's role toward those held by

significant evaluators (Edgar & Warren, 1969); to become more custodial in their attitudes toward pupil control (e.g., Hoy, 1968; McArthur, 1978); to feel that they possess less knowledge about teaching at the end than at the beginning of the first year (e.g., Gaede, 1978); to shift from progressive to more conventional teaching perspectives (e.g., Hanson & Herrington, 1976); and to rate themselves as less happy and inspiring at the end of the first year than at the beginning (e.g., Wright & Tuska, 1968). Almost all of these studies suggest that there is a loss of idealism during the first year and point to the notion of "reality shock" as a fact of life for first-year teachers. Lacey (1977, p. 48) summarizes the impression given by much of this research as follows:

> The major findings of this research underlines the importance of discontinuity between training and the reality of teaching. The attitudes of beginning teachers undergo dramatic change as they establish themselves in the profession away from the liberal ideas of their student days toward the traditional patterns in many schools.

Although there is much empirical research which supports the view that attitudes evidenced at the end of student teaching are abandoned by the end of the first year, there is also research which demonstrates a great deal of stability between student teaching and the end of the first year. Many, such as Bartholomew (1976), Giroux (1980), and Zeichner and Tabachnick (1981) have challenged the commonly accepted view that the socializing impact of the university is liberalizing and that the socializing influence of the workplace is conservative in relation to the university's influence.[1] Furthermore, empirical studies such as those conducted by Power (1981) and Petty and Hogben (1980) in Australia and by Mardle and Walker (1980) in England support this hesitancy to accept

the view of a "progressive-traditional" shift in teaching perspectives during the first year and demonstrate that certain attitudes of beginning teachers appear to be resistant to change (e.g., perceptions of self in the teaching role). Power (1981, p. 213) summarizes the impression given by this set of studies when he concludes:

> The present evidence calls into question the pessimistic statements about reality shock for beginning teachers. If the conditions described by Dreeben (1970). . . existed in this study and had the impact they suggested, it is difficult to believe that the influence would not be reflected in teachers' perceptions of themselves in the teaching role, in their evaluation of teaching as an occupational activity or in their vocational interests and aspirations, even at the group level. But no such evidence appeared in the present data. It can be speculated that teacher training has a greater impact on the professional socialization of teachers than has been realized.

Others, such as Petty and Hogben (1980), Mardle and Walker (1980), and Goodlad (1982), also call into question the notion of reality shock, but see anticipatory socialization as the most significant influence on teacher development.

> Indeed preservice experience may be more profoundly influential than either the efficacy of training or the colleague control of later years . . . . Teachers do not become resocialized during their course of training nor in the reality of the classroom, since in essence this is a reality which they never actually left. (Mardle & Walker, 1980, pp. 99, 103)

It should be noted that in <u>both</u> groups of studies, those that demonstrate changes and those which do not, some teachers experienced significant shifts in attitudes while others did not. Furthermore, among those who changed, the changes were often in different directions. The conclusions of all of these researchers regarding continuity or discontinuity between student teaching and the end of the first year have been based in

each instance on central tendencies or mean shifts in attitudes in the groups of teachers studied.[2] For example, despite his challenge to the notion of reality shock for beginning teachers Power (1981, p. 290) concludes:

> The results show the transition from student teacher to teacher to be characterized by remarkable stability . . . . It can be seen that as a group, the sample revealed no significant change in perception of self in the teaching role . . . . At the same time . . . while there is group stability, there is considerable systematic individual change . . . . There was little or no change for the majority of subjects, but there were some subjects whose scores changed moderately to substantially in one or the other direction.

In the final analysis when attention is focused on the socialization of individual beginning teachers, neither group of studies is very helpful in illuminating how specific beginning teachers are socialized in particular settings. We are almost never given specific information in these studies about the personal characteristics and life histories of the teachers or detailed information about the settings in which they work. On the one hand, first-year teachers are seen as prisoners of the past (either anticipatory socialization or preservice training), and on the other hand they are seen as prisoners of the present (institutional pressures emanating from the workplace). Significantly, in neither case are beginning teachers viewed as making any substantial contributions to the quality or strength of their induction.

We would like to suggest that neither of these views is very helpful in understanding beginning teacher socialization; that conformity (to the past or present) is not the only outcome of induction; and that even when conformity does occur, it occurs in different degrees, in different forms, has different meanings for different individual teachers

and within different institutional contexts. The problem at hand can be cast in relation to two alternative rubrics for conceptualizing the induction of beginning teachers. On the one hand, there is the view that the actions of beginning teachers undergo a process of institutionalization. According to this view, beginning teachers are overpowered by institutional press and must either adapt to existing institutional regularities and norms or leave the institution. Hanson and Herrington (1976, p. 80), drawing upon the work of Berger and Luckman, present a summary of the outcome of this process of institutionalization:

> Any human activity that has been institutionalized has been subsumed under social control. The more conduct is institutionalized, the more predictable and controlled it becomes. When two persons interact within an institution, the process ends with "this is how things are done," things attain firmness in consciousness; become objectivated activity.

On the other hand, the process of beginning teacher induction can be viewed as one of socialization.[3] Despite the fact that, historically, studies of teacher socialization have emphasized how institutions changed teachers and, as Colin Lacey (1977) states, portray the teacher as a relatively passive entity always giving way to socializing forces, occupational socialization, as it has been defined by seminal theorists in the field, such as Parsons (1962), Merton (1957), and Hughes (1958), clearly account for individuals as both recipients and creators of perspectives. Today, in studies of both childhood and adult socialization, the interactional nature of the socialization process is widely accepted by advocates of various theoretical persuasions and the term socialization treats the internalization of institutional norms as problematic. The term socialization, connoting an interplay between individuals' intentions

and institutional constraints, is succinctly described by Berger and Luckman (1967, pp. 173-74):

> The social processes involved in both the formation and maintenance of identity are determined by the social structure. Conversely, the identities produced by the interplay of organism, individual consciousness and social structure react upon the given social structure, maintaining it, modifying it, or even reshaping it.

We will now examine in relation to a longitudinal study of four beginning teachers, whether the induction of first-year teachers can more accurately be depicted as a process of institutionalization or socialization. Given the view of many researchers (e.g., Ryan, 1970; Tisher, 1982) that the induction of beginning teachers is highly context specific, related in each instance to unique interactions of persons (who possess varying levels of skills and capabilities and various individual histories) with school contexts (which differ in the constraints and possibilities they present to beginning teachers), it becomes necessary to study how specific beginning teachers are inducted into particular school contexts in order to develop generalizations about entry into the teaching role. The alternative strategy studies how beginning teachers are inducted into schools by discovering central tendencies of groups of beginning teachers while assuming schools to be relatively homogeneous as a group. This approach tends to obscure potentially important differences among teachers and among schools. As can be seen from the reports of research reviewed earlier, it has not succeeded thus far in explaining the process of beginning teacher socialization.

Before discussing the findings from our study of four beginning teachers we will describe the nature of the study, including the questions that were asked and the data collection methods that were used.

Studying the Development of Perspectives

We began in the Spring of 1981 by studying the impact of the elementary student teaching experience at one large state university on the development of teaching perspectives by 13 student teachers. The selection of these 13 students gave us a representative sample from this particular program of teaching ideologies, classroom contexts, school organizational structures, grade levels and school/community demographic characteristics.[4] Teaching perspectives were defined according to the Becker et al. (1961) definition used in Boys in white as:

> A coordinated set of ideas and actions a person uses in dealing with some problematic situation, to refer to a person's ordinary way of thinking and feeling about and acting on such a situation. These thoughts and actions are coordinated in the sense that the actions flow reasonably, from the actor's point of view, from the ideas contained in the perspective. Similarly, the ideas can be seen by an observer to be one of the possible sets of ideas which might form the underlying rationale for the person's actions and are seen by the actor as providing a justification for acting as he does. (p. 34)

According to this definition, perspectives differ from attitudes since they include actions and not merely dispositions to act. Also, perspectives were defined in relation to the specific classroom situations faced by the student teachers and do not necessarily represent generalized beliefs or ideologies. During this first phase of our work, we sought to identify the teaching perspectives of the 13 student teachers in relation to four specific domains (knowledge and curriculum, the teacher's role, teacher-pupil relationships and student diversity) and to identify any changes which took place in the perspectives of the students during the 15-week semester. We also sought to identify the various individual and institutional factors that were related to the development of perspectives toward teaching. During this semester we interviewed each student a minimum

of five times, observed them while teaching a minimum of three times, interviewed their cooperating teachers and university supervisors, examined journals kept by the students, and examined transcripts of their weekly student teaching seminars.

During the 1981-82 school year, we followed four of the original group of 13 individuals into their first year of teaching and asked two questions related to the general theme of teacher development: (1) How were the teaching perspectives, evidenced at the end of student teaching, strengthened or modified during the first year? Here, we wanted to describe the continuities and discontinuities between the socializing conditions of student teaching and those of the workplace during the first year. (2) Who and what influenced the development of teacher perspectives during the first year? Here, we were interested in identifying the personal characteristics of the beginning teachers and the characteristics of the institutions in which they worked that appeared to encourage resistance to or compliance with particular institutional pressures regarding teaching. We explored how and from whom these teachers learned about institutional norms and the extent to which these teachers adapted to the existing institutional regularities in their schools. We also explored whether and how the "institution" attempted to monitor and elicit compliance with particular institutional norms.

During this second phase of our work, we continued to use the four orienting categories of teacher perspectives to describe teacher actions and ideas. Each of the four orienting categories was further defined in terms of several specific "dilemmas" of teaching which had emerged from analyses of the data from the first phase of the study. Appendix A identifies and defines the 17 dilemmas of teaching that were associated with the four orienting

categories. These 17 dilemmas gave direction to our data collection efforts during the second phase of the study.[5]

Between August, 1981, and May, 1982, we spent three one-week periods in the schools of each of the four teachers. A specific research plan was followed during each of the three weeks of data collection. During four days of each week, an observer constructed narrative descriptions of events in each classroom using the four orienting categories and related "dilemmas" as an orienting framework. All of the teachers were interviewed several times each day regarding their plans for instruction (e.g., purposes and rationales for particular activities) and their reactions to what had occurred. One day each week, an observer constructed a narrative description of classroom events with a particular focus on six pupils in each classroom who had been selected to represent the range of student diversity that existed in each classroom.

In addition to the daily interviews with each teacher that focused on particular events that had been observed, a minimum of two in-depth interviews were conducted with each teacher during each of the two data collection periods. These interviews sought in part to explore teachers' views regarding their own professional development in relation to the four orienting categories of perspectives and also addressed additional dimensions of perspectives unique to each teacher which had emerged during the first year. Finally, the six "target" pupils in each classroom were interviewed individually once during each data collection period to enable us to determine how classroom life was experienced by individual pupils. These pupil interviews enabled us to confirm or disconfirm our own observations of how pupils reacted to classroom events and to check the accuracy of teacher statements regarding how time was spent in the classroom during the weeks that we were

not present. Through the classroom observations and teacher and pupil interviews, we sought to monitor the continuing development of teacher perspectives and to construct in-depth portraits of life in each of the four classrooms. Additionally, we sought to investigate the influence of several social context variables on the development of teacher perspectives: (1) school ethos and tradition; (2) teacher culture; (3) student culture (4) parental expectations; (5) school demographic characteristics; and (6) material constraints on teachers' work such as curriculum guidelines. During the two in-depth interviews that were held within each of the data collection periods, we asked each of the four teachers about their perceptions of the constraints and encouragements in their schools and about how they learned what was and was not acceptable behavior for teachers in their particular situations. We were particularly interested in the degree to which each teacher felt she was free to employ initiative and independent judgment in her work and the extent to which each teacher felt she had to conform to the expectations of others with respect to what to teach, how to teach and how to organize and manage her classroom.

We also interviewed each principal at least once and interviewed two teachers in each school concerning their views of institutional pressures (e.g., constraints and encouragements). We also collected many kinds of formal documents in each school such as curriculum guides and teacher handbooks. Tape recorded interviews with teachers, pupils and principals and classroom observations were transcribed to facilitate a content analysis of the data. Several analyses of the data conducted from May, 1982 - March, 1983 led to the construction of four case studies which describe the journeys of each teacher and the individual and social influences on their development from the beginning of student teaching to the end of the first year.[6]

The four teachers, who were all women, worked in a variety of settings: (1) in urban, rural, and suburban schools; (2) in schools that served very different kinds of communities (e.g., one school served children of upper-middle-class professionals and managers, a second school served children of industrial workers, etc.). Three teachers worked in self-contained classroom settings with minimal departmentalization, while the fourth teacher worked in an architecturally open-plan school with total departmentalization within teaching teams. Three were the only first-year teachers in their respective buildings, while one teacher had ready access to other beginners. Two were the only teachers at their respective grade levels, while two teachers worked with other teachers who taught the same grade or, in one case, the same pupils. Three of the four teachers taught at the seventh- or eighth-grade level and one teacher taught at the fourth-grade level. All of the teachers left the university with fairly similar teaching perspectives, according to our typology (see Tabachnick, Zeichner, et al., 1982). They all worked in settings very different from those they experienced as student teachers. Following is a summary of selected characteristics of the settings that the four individuals worked in as student teachers and as first-year teachers.

Hannah

(1) Student Teaching: Hannah taught along with four certified teachers in one of two fifth-/sixth-grade teams in an architecturally open suburban middle school (grades 4-6) enrolling about 500 children. Hannah had her own homeroom class of around 30 pupils and worked with all of the approximately 125 pupils on her team at one time or another, since the instructional program was totally departmentalized. The school community includes few minorities and has a mix of parents ranging from a few who were very poor to some who were highly paid professionals. Some of the parents owned or worked on farms, others worked in the village in which the school was located, and the majority commuted to work to a nearby city

with a population of around 175,000. The majority of parents were moderately well-off and lived in the village.

(2) First-Year: Hannah was the only eighth-grade teacher in a nine-classroom (K-8) public school enrolling about 190 pupils. This school is located in a rural farm community a few miles outside of a city with a population of around 9,000. Hannah taught all subjects, except civics, to her eighth-grade class and taught science to the seventh graders while her class went next door to the seventh-grade teacher for instruction in civics. The parents of the children in her class were very diverse socioeconomically, ranging from those who were farm owners and professionals to those who were farm workers.

Rachel

(1) Student Teaching: Rachel taught in one of three fourth-/fifth-grade classrooms in a K-5, public elementary school (enrolling about 400 children) located in a city with a population of around 175,000. The school community includes a few minorities and has a mix of parents who range from moderately to very affluent. Most of the parents whose children attend this school are either self-employed professionals (e.g., physicians, lawyers), employed by a nearby state university or in state government. Rachel worked with one cooperating teacher and taught all subjects to her class of fourth- and fifth-graders.

(2) First-Year: Rachel was the only seventh-grade teacher in a nine-classroom (K-8) parochial school located in the downtown area of a heavy industrialized city with a population of around 120,000. She taught all subjects except science to her seventh-grade class and taught social studies to the eighth-grade class across the corridor, while the eighth-grade teacher taught science to her seventh-graders. This school was fairly homogeneous with regard to the income level and ethnic background of its population. Most of the children in Rachel's class were of Italian heritage and some had been born overseas and had recently moved to this city so that their parents could obtain work at the local manufacturing plant. Most of their parents were unemployed at the time of the study and had recently been laid off from this factory, which was located a few blocks from the school.

Beth

(1) Student Teaching: Beth taught in one of four self-contained fifth-grade classrooms, in a K-5 elementary school, located in a city with a population of around 175,000. The community includes a mix of parents who are young professionals, or work at skilled trades and commerce. There are few very affluent families and few qualify for welfare.

(2) First-Year: Beth taught as part of one of three eighth-grade teams, in an architecturally open middle school (grades 6-8) located in a suburban community about ten miles from a city of about 500,000. Beth's team consisted of herself and two other teachers, both men and both with more than ten years of experience. She was responsible for teaching four math classes and three reading/language arts class regularly and participated with her two team colleagues in planning instruction and teaching elements of units in social studies. The community in which this school was located had some light industry, but most residents worked in or on the edge of the large nearby city. They were much like the parents of the pupils she had known as a student teacher--professionals, well-paid skilled trades workers and self-employed people who were moderately well-to-do.

Sarah

(1) Student Teaching: Sarah taught in a self-contained junior primary class, with one cooperating teacher and with children who had completed kindergarten, but were judged not ready for first-grade work. This class was in a K-5 public elementary school, located in a suburban community near a city with a population of 175,000. The community includes a mix of parents who range from moderately to very affluent.

(2) First-Year: Sarah was one of three fourth-grade teachers in a K-5 public elementary school, located in a suburban community five miles outside a city with a population of 500,000. This school served a community which was very homogeneous socio-economically. The majority of the parents were moderately to very affluent. Sarah taught all subjects to her class of fourth-graders for most of the year and later in the year taught science to another fourth-grade class, while her class went to one of the other fourth-grade teachers for instruction in social studies.

Table 1 summarizes some of the salient characteristics of the school contexts in which these four teachers worked during student-teaching and the first year.

Insert Table 1 Here

Institutionalization or Socialization?
The Social Strategies of Beginning Teachers

We found a conceptual framework developed by Colin Lacey (1977) to be very useful in helping us understand the degree to which the four teachers conformed to institutional norms and the extent to which they either abandoned or maintained teaching perspectives brought to the first year. Lacey (1977) challenges Becker's (1964) notion of "situational adjustment" (i.e., "the individual turns himself into the kind of person the situation demands") as the only possible outcome of occupational socialization and proposes the construct of social strategy as a heuristic device for understanding how and to what degree beginning teachers are socialized into their roles. Lacey's framework rests on the important distinction (also drawn by Rosow, 1965) between socialization in terms of value commitment and behavioral conformity.

Lacey (1977, pp. 67-68) defines a social strategy as the purposeful selection of ideas and actions by prospective teachers and the working out of their interrelationships in specific situations. He then identifies three distinct strategies that he claims are employed by prospective teachers

in the face of institutional constraints. First, internalized adjustment refers to a response where individuals comply with the authority figure's definition of a situation and believe these constraints to be for the best. This strategy indicates those situations where an individual willingly develops into the kind of person the situation demands and socialization entails both behavioral conformity and value commitment.

On the other hand, strategic compliance refers to those instances where individuals comply with the constraints posed by a situation, but retain private reservations about doing so. This strategy implies that individuals do not act in ways consistent with their underlying beliefs, and conformity is essentially an adaptive response without the corresponding value basis on which the behavior presumably rests. Finally, the strategy of strategic redefinition refers to those situations where successful attempts to change are made by individuals who do not possess the formal power to do so. These individuals attempt to widen the range of acceptable behaviors in a situation and to introduce new and creative elements into a social setting.[7] If institutionalization more accurately describes the processes of beginning teachers' induction into their roles, the strategy of internalized adjustment would be the modal outcome of the process. If, on the other hand, socialization is a more accurate descriptor for what occurs, one should find evidence of the other social strategies as well.

Our research (described above) provides some support for an interactive process of socialization, in which behavioral conformity and value commitment may vary independently. As we reported in phase one of our study (Tabachnick, Zeichner et al., 1982), 10 of the 13 students responded in their student teaching with the social strategy of internalized adjustment. The meaning of this response was very different for these students than the usual

meaning of conforming to pressure or passive acceptance of an institutionally approved perspective. Each of the 10 participated actively in selecting the student teaching placement. Several rejected placements that did not appear to them to conform to their [the students'] image of a classroom compatible with their perspectives toward teaching. Although all 13 students engaged in each of the three social strategies at various times during the semester in relation to particular aspects of their experiences, the dominant mode of response for three students (including Hannah) was one of strategic compliance. Each of these individuals for different reasons reacted strongly against the constraints posed in their schools and/or by the university, but because of the nature of the constraints and because of their low status as student teachers, they generally acted in ways demanded by their situations while maintaining strong private reservations about doing so.

For example, Hannah, who selected her student-teaching placement because it was one of the few paid positions in the program, openly questioned from the very beginning of her student-teaching experience the departmentalized organizational structure of her school, the rationalized and standardized curriculum (where objectives, content, and materials were largely predetermined), and the distant and formal relations between teachers and pupils which were part of the taken-for-granted reality of her school. However, feeling alone and getting constant pressure from her colleagues and pupils to conform to the dominant culture of her school, Hannah made a conscious decision by the end of the sixth week of her experience to strategically comply with the accepted way of life in her school. From the seventh week on, Hannah stuck more closely to the required curriculum and kept her discontent to herself.

Throughout the semester, our own observations, Hannah's statements, and the comments from her cooperating teacher and university supervisor strongly confirmed that Hannah's compromises after the sixth week represented only behavioral conformity without an underlying value commitment. Because Hannah was not able to get the guidance that she desired as a student teacher, she was not able to develop (as did Rachel, Sarah, and Beth) the skills and strategies necessary for realizing her goals. Hannah reacted strongly against becoming the kind of teacher she saw around her, but did not develop well articulated perspectives consistent with her own vision of teaching.

In the second phase of our study we find stronger support for an interactive process of socialization, since the modal response (three of the four teachers) is strategic redefinition. As was the case during student teaching, each of the four individuals engaged in each of the social strategies at various times during the year in relation to particular aspects of their work. All teachers maintained internal doubts about some of their actions during the year and all were fully committed to other aspects of their work. Finally, all of the teachers engaged in some form of strategic redefinition during the year and introduced at least some new and creative elements into their schools. However, despite the variety of strategies employed by each teacher, there was also a dominant strategy (or strategies, in one case) which characterized the experience of each teacher.

Specifically, three of the four teachers (Hannah, Rachel, Sarah) attempted significantly to redefine the range of acceptable behaviors in their schools in various ways (e.g., in relation to teacher-pupil relationships, the curriculum), while only one teacher (Beth) experienced adjustment to the dominant norms in her school at the level of both values and behaviors.

Two of the three "strategic redefiners" (Sarah and Hannah) were successful in their efforts while the third (Rachel) failed for various reasons in her efforts to establish her "deviant" teaching style. In the cases of the two successful "redefiners," Hannah did so openly in plain view of her colleagues and principal and under strong pressures to conform, while Sarah did so covertly and subtly, within the walls of her classroom, after a period of internalized adjustment to a school culture which encouraged (although in a restrained way) the use of independent judgment and initiative by teachers.

There were many reasons in each case why attempts at strategic redefinition either failed or succeeded. Among these were the degree to which teaching perspectives were developed at the beginning of the year and the strength with which they were held, the coping skills and political sensitivity of the teachers, the degree of contradiction between formal and informal school cultures and the reactions of pupils to the teachers. We were particularly impressed with the tenacity with which Rachel and Hannah clung to their perspectives under strong pressures to change and with the key role played by pupil responses in strengthening or modifying these perspectives. Table 2 summarizes the dominant social strategies employed by the four teachers during student teaching and the first year.

Insert Table 2 here

Without going into detail here about the combination of specific factors in each case that led to successful or unsuccessful redefinition or to internalized adjustment in the case of Beth,[8] we feel that our study clearly demonstrates that the adaptation of beginning teachers to institutional

regularities (institutionalization, if you will) cannot be taken for granted and that first-year teachers under some conditions at least can have a creative impact on their workplaces and survive.[9]

These findings also call into question the definition of teaching perspectives as situationally specific. Despite the fact that three of the four teachers worked in very different situations as student teachers than as first-year teachers (different in terms of the kinds of constraints and possibilities they presented teachers, different in terms of school traditions and cultures), two of these three teachers attempted to implement a style of pedagogy similar to that which was evidenced during student teaching. Only one teacher (Beth) significantly changed her perspectives in response to differing institutional demands. The fourth teacher (Sarah) found herself in a situation very similar to that experienced as a student teacher. After an initial period of internalized adjustment, Sarah continued to develop her perspectives in a manner consistent with her initial predispositions going beyond what was common practice in her school.

In summary, despite differing institutional contexts during student teaching and the first year, beginning teachers under some conditions at least were able to maintain a perspective which was in conflict with the dominant institutional cultures in their schools.

One possible explanation for the resilience of beginning teachers in the face of institutional pressure is that the pressure of the institution is often contradictory in nature. Despite arguments by Hoy (1968) and others that there is a homogeneous school culture into which neophytes are socialized, we found, consistent with the studies of Carey and Lightfoot (1979), Metz (1978), and Hammersley (1977), that school cultures were often diverse and that various "subcultures" were easily identifiable in all but

one school and that they attempted to influence the beginning teachers in often contradictory ways. In the two cases where teachers were able to redefine various aspects of their work successfully, these contradictions within the school culture (particularly contradictions between the formal and informal school cultures) played a significant role in enabling the teachers successfully to implement a style of teaching which was very different from that which went on around them. However, in the one case of unsuccessful strategic redefinition a very strong and homogeneous school culture in opposition to the teacher's preferred style played a significant role in blocking this teacher's efforts to succeed in a manner consistent with her initial predispositions. School cultures are apparently not always diverse and contradictory within any one setting, but when they are, the contradictions seem to provide room for beginning teachers to implement a "deviant" pedagogy, or at least to establish individual expressions of teaching. In any case, whatever the explanation, it seems clear the beginning teachers give some direction to the strength and quality of their socialization into teaching. There is very little evidence in our data which would support the kind of passive response to institutional forces and unthinking acquiesence to institutional demands which has been described frequently in both the literature of student teaching (Gibson, 1976) and of teaching (Schwille, 1979).

Table 1

The Four Teachers: Student Teaching and the First Year

	Student Teaching	The First Year
Hannah	4th-5th grade	8th grade
	total departmentalization within teams	self contained/minimal departmentalization
	suburban	rural
		only teacher at her grade level
		only first-year teacher in her school
Rachel	4th-5th grade	7th grade
	self-contained class	self-contained/minimal departmentalization
	urban	urban
		only teacher at her grade level
		only first-year teacher in her school
Beth	5th grade	8th grade
	self-contained class	heavy departmentalization within teams
	urban	suburban
		one of nine teachers at her grade level
		only first-year teacher in her school
Sarah	junior primary	4th grade
	self-contained class	self-contained/minimal departmentalization
	suburban	suburban
		one of 3 teachers at her grade level
		one of 2 first-year teachers in her school

Table 2

Predominant Social Strategies Employed by the Four Teachers During Student Teaching and the First Year

	Student Teaching	The First Year
Hannah	Strategic compliance	Successful strategic redefinition
Rachel	Internalized adjustment	Unsuccessful strategic redefinition
Beth	Internalized adjustment	Internalized adjustment
Sarah	Internalized adjustment	Internalized adjustment and successful strategic redefinition

Notes

[1]In an earlier paper (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981) we outline three different scenarios found in the literature for how the schools and the university influence teacher development. Also see Zeichner (1983) for a review of alternative explanations for beginning teacher socialization.

[2]Also, very few of the researchers in either group have conducted analyses of observed teaching. With few exceptions, these studies have relied exclusively on teacher reports or attitude surveys for their data. See Zeichner and Grant (1981) and Tabachnick et al. (1982) for discussions of the limitations of survey research in attempting to understand the subtle processes of teacher development.

[3]Lortie (1975, p. 80), in his emphasis on the primacy of anticipatory socialization in teacher development, questions the use of the term socialization to describe entry into the teaching role: "The connotations of the term socialization seem somewhat askew when applied to this kind of induction, since they imply greater receptivity to a preexisting culture than seems to prevail. Teachers are largely self-made; the internalization of common knowledge plays only a limited part in their movement into work responsibility."

[4]More detailed information about this portion of the study, including the selection of the sample and data collection methods is provided in Tabachnick, Zeichner et al., 1982.

[5]See Berlak and Berlak (1981) for a discussion of the concept of "dilemmas" of teaching.

[6]These case studies are presented in Tabachnick, Zeichner et al., 1983.

[7]While Lacey seems to reserve this term for only those attempts at redefinition that are successful, we broaden the definition of strategic redefinition to include both those attempts which are successful and those which are not. In this way the framework can now account for all instances of overt deviance. Obviously, one cannot determine which of the two types of strategic redefinition has occurred until the process has been completed. Furthermore, each of the two varieties of strategic redefinition may lead to different outcomes. For example, if an individual fails in a change attempt, he/she may choose to leave the organization or to engage in one of the strategies of situational adjustment. On the other hand, if the attempt is successful, the behavior might now fall within the range of acceptable responses within the institution.

[8]See Tabachnick, Zeichner et al. (1983) for the case studies of the four teachers and for more specific information about the development of each teacher.

[9]In terms of survival, two of the teachers (Hannah and Beth) were rehired and are currently teaching in the same schools at the same grade levels. Rachel was offered a contract for the following year, but did not sign it. Sarah was laid off because of a decline in pupil enrollment and is currently teaching in another school district.

References

Bartholomew, J. Schooling teachers: The myth of the liberal college. In G. Whitty and J. M. Young (Eds.), Explorations in the politics of school knowledge. Driffield, England: Nafferton Books, 1976.

Becker, H. Personal change in adult life. Sociometry, 1964, 27, 40-53.

Becker, H., Greer, B., Hughes, E., & Strauss, A. Boys in white. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. The social construction of reality. NY: Doubleday, 1967.

Berlak, A., & Berlak, H. Dilemmas of schooling: Teaching and social change. London: Methuen, 1981.

Carew, J., & Lightfoot, S. L. Beyond bias: Perspectives on classrooms. Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Day, H. Attitude changes of beginning teachers after initial teaching experience. Journal of Teacher Education, 1959, 10, 326-328.

Edgar, D., & Warren, R. Power and autonomy in teacher socialization. Sociology of Education, 1969, 42, 386-399.

Gaede, O. F. Reality shock: A problem among first year teachers. Clearinghouse, 1978, 51, 405-409.

Gibson, R. The effects of school practice: The development of student perspectives. British Journal of Teacher Education, 1976, 2, 241-250.

Giroux, H. Teacher education and the idiology of social control. Journal of Education, 1980, 162, 5-27.

Goodlad, J. Let's get on with the reconstruction. Kappan, 1982, 63, 19-20.

Hammersley, M. The social location of teacher perspectives. Milton Keynes, England: The Open University Press, 1977.

Hanson, D., & Herrington, M. From college to classroom: The probationary year. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1976.

Hoy, W. The influence of experience on the beginning teacher. School Review, 1968, 76, 312-323.

Hughes, E. Men and their work. Glencoe, Ill: The Free Press, 1958.

Lacey, C. The socialization of teachers. London: Methuen, 1977.

Ligana, J. What happens to the attitudes of beginning teachers? Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers, 1970.

Lortie, E. Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Mardle, G., & Walker, M. Strategies and structure: Critical notes on teacher socialization. In P. Woods (Ed.), Teacher strategies: Explorations in the sociology of the school. London: Croom Helm, 1980.

Merton, R., Reader, G., & Kendall, P. The student physician. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Metz, M. Classroom and corridors. Berkeley, Calif: University of California Press, 1978.

McArthur, J. What does teaching do to teachers? Educational Administration Quarterly, 1978, 14, 89-103.

Parsons, T. Individual autonomy and social pressure. Psychoanalysis and Psychoanalytic Review, 1962, 49, 70-79.

Petty, M., & Hogben, D. Explorations of semantic space with beginning teachers: A study of socialization into teaching. British Journal of Teacher Education, 1980, 6, 51-61.

Power, P. G. Aspects of the transition from education student to beginning teacher. Australian Journal of Education, 1981, 25, 288-296.

Rosow, I. Forms and functions of adult socialization. Social Forces, 1965, 44, 35-45.

Ryan, K. Don't smile until Christmas: Accounts of the first year of teaching. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Schwille, J. et al. Factors influencing teachers decisions about what to teacher. East Lansing, Michigan: Institute for Research on Teaching. Research Series No. 62, 1979.

Tabachnick, B., Zeichner, K., Densmore, K., Adler, S., & Egan, K. The impact of the student teaching experience on the development of teacher perspectives. A paper presented at the annual meeting of AERA, New York, April 1982.

Tabachnick, B. R., Zeichner, K., Densmore, K., & Hudak, G. The development of teacher perspectives. A paper presented at the annual meeting of AERA, Montreal, April 1983.

Tisher, R. Teacher induction: An international perspective on research and programs. A paper presented at the annual meeting of AERA, New York, April, 1982.

Wright, B., & Tuska, S. From dream to life in the psychology of becoming a teacher. School Review, 1968, 76, 253-293.

Zeichner, K. Individual and institutional factors related to the socialization of beginning teachers. A paper presented at the National Invitational Conference "The first years of teaching: What are the pertinent issues?" Austin, Texas: The University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, March 1983.

Zeichner, K., & Grant, C. Biography and social structure in the socialization of beginning teachers. Journal of Education for Teaching, 1981, 1, 298-314..

Zeichner, K., & Tabachnick, B. Are the effects of university teacher education "washed out" by school experience? Journal of Teacher Education, 1981, 32, 7-11.

APPENDIX A

Dilemmas of Teaching

Following are the definitions for each of the 17 dilemmas that were used to define teacher perspectives in this study. These dilemmas represent a refinement of our initial orienting framework and emerged from our study of 13 student teachers. If a dilemma was also utilized by Berlak and Berlak (1981) and/or by Hammersley (1977) this fact is noted in parenthesis at the end of the description of the dilemma.

Knowledge and Curriculum

1. Public Knowledge--Personal Knowledge

On the one hand, an emphasis on public knowledge indicates a view that school knowledge consists primarily of accumulated bodies of information, skills, facts, etc. which exist external to and independent of the learner. On the other hand, an emphasis on personal knowledge indicates a view that the value of school knowledge is established primarily through its relationship to the learner. Implicit in this position is the view that school knowledge is useful and significant only insofar as it enables persons to make sense of their experience.

What is at issue here is the clarity of the distinction that the teacher makes between public knowledge on the one hand and pupils' everyday knowledge on the other. To what degree is students' personal knowledge ruled out as irrelevant in the teacher's definition of the school curriculum? To what degree does the teacher allow or even encourage children's interests, background experiences, etc. to contribute to the school curriculum? (Berlak & Berlak; Hammersley)

2. Knowledge is Product--Knowledge is Process

An emphasis on knowledge as product indicates a view of school knowledge as organized bodies of information, facts, theories, etc., and the evaluation of pupil learning is seen as a question of conformity to or deviance from specifications laid down by the teacher (e.g., the "correct" answer). The process by which the answer is reached is regarded as relatively unproblematic. Here there is a concern for the reproduction of an answer by whatever means. On the other hand, a knowledge as process emphasis indicates a concern with the thinking and reasoning underlying the production of a product and this thinking process is viewed as a way of establishing the truth or validity of a body of content. The central issue here is whether mastery of content or substance takes priority over the mastery of skills of thinking and reasoning. (Berlak & Berlak; Hammersley)

3. Knowledge is Certain--Knowledge is Problematic

An emphasis on knowledge as certain indicates an approach to school knowledge as truth "out there" to be uncritically accepted by children. On the other hand, where the emphasis is on knowledge as problematic, school knowledge is treated as constructed, tentative, and subject to social, political, and cultural influences. Here there is a concern with developing children's creative and critical abilities. (Berlak & Berlak)

4. Learning is Fragmented--Learning is Holistic

An emphasis on learning is fragmented indicates a view that learning is the accumulation of discrete parts or pieces; when one has mastered the pieces, one "knows" the whole. There is little concern that the parts be seen in relationship to the whole either before, during, or after the learning experience. From the learning is holistic perspective, the understanding of a whole is sought and is seen as a process that is something more than the learning of a series of parts. Learning is seen as the active construction of meaning by persons, and opportunities are provided for pupils to mentally act upon the material and to relate it to something already known. (Berlak & Berlak)

5. Learning is Unrelated--Learning is Integrated

This element is concerned with the degree to which teachers view school knowledge as compartmentalized within specific disciplines or content areas (unrelated) or the degree to which the boundaries between content areas are blurred (integrated). An integrated curricular emphasis would indicate that the teacher has made efforts to subordinate previously insulated subject areas to some relational idea or theme. (Hammersley)

6. Learning is Collective--Individual Activity

From the perspective of learning is an individual activity, learning proceeds best as an individual encounter between the child and material or between the child and teacher. Learning is seen as a function of each individual child's particular capabilities and/or motivation. On the other hand, an emphasis on learning as a collective activity indicates a view that learning proceeds best when ideas are exchanged in a cooperative and supportive setting where one person can test out his/her ideas against those of others. There is thought to be a construction of meaning by the community of learners that goes beyond what can be gained by individual encounters with materials and with teachers. (Berlak & Berlak; Hammersley)

7. Teacher-Pupil Control over Pupil Learning: High--Low

The question here is the degree of control that the teacher versus pupils exert over such aspects of learning as when pupils are to begin an activity, how long they are to work at a particular

task, how pupils are to perform the tasks, and criteria by which student work is evaluated. (Berlak & Berlak; Hammersley)

Teacher-Pupil Relationships

8. Distant--Personal Teacher-Pupil Relationships

A distant orientation to teacher-pupil relationships indicates a desire to maintain relatively detached and formal relationships with children, to maintain "a guarded professional face." On the other hand, a personal orientation to teacher-pupil relationships indicates a desire to establish close, informal, and honest relationships with children. Here the teacher is observed interacting with pupils about matters other than schoolwork, and "participates" with pupils rather than remaining detached. (Berlak & Berlak)

9. Teacher vs. Pupil Control over Pupil Behavior: High--Low

On the one hand, high control over pupil behavior indicates that the teacher makes many explicit rules for governing a wide range of pupil behavior. On the other hand, low control over pupil behavior indicates that children are asked to assume a great deal of responsibility for their behavior. There are not many explicit rules, and those that do exist are relatively ambiguous and/or narrow in scope. (Hammersley)

The Teacher's Role

10. The Teacher's Role: What to Teach.
Bureaucratic--Functional--Independent

This element addresses the teacher's conception of his/her role regarding what to teach in relation to institutional requirements of schools and/or school districts. On the one hand, a bureaucratic response indicates that the teacher generally follows with little question the school curriculum that is prescribed by a school or school district. Here the teacher feels that it is inappropriate to alter that content which is prescribed from above, and the teacher recognizes the legitimate role of the institution to dictate practically all of the content of the school curriculum. On the other hand, a functional response indicates that there is evidence that the teacher adapts and interprets prescribed content for use in their particular situation. Finally, an independent response indicates that a teacher shows evidence of actively constructing curricular content independent of institutional directives. Here teachers may even ignore institutional directives and substitute content that they and/or the children have decided to address.

11. The Teacher's Role: How to Teach.
Bureaucratic--Functional--Independent

This element addresses the teacher's conception of his/her role regarding methods of instruction and is concerned with the degree of personal discretion utilized by teachers in determining the processes of their lessons. Bureaucratic, functional, and independent responses are defined as in the preceding dilemma.

12. The Teacher's Role: School Rules and Regulations.
Bureaucratic--Functional--Independent

This element addresses the teacher's conception of his/her role in relation to school rules and regulations. A bureaucratic, functional, and independent response are defined as above.

Student Diversity

13. Children as Unique--Children as Members of a Category

This dimension focuses on the degree to which teachers think about children as alike (a focus on shared characteristics) or in terms of a unique mix of many dimensions. How many and what kinds of categories does the teacher use to draw distinctions among children and how differentiated are the various categories? (Berlak & Berlak)

14. Universalism--Particularism: School Curriculum

A universalistic position would indicate a belief that all children should be exposed to the same curriculum either at the same time or at a different pace. On the other hand, a particularistic response indicates that a teacher feels and acts in a way that indicates a concern that there are some elements of the curriculum that should be offered only to certain individuals or groups of children. (Hammersley)

15. Universalism--Particularism: Student Behavior

A universalistic position indicates a situation where the same rules for behavior are applied to all students (e.g., uniform sanctions for the same transgressions). A particularistic position indicates a situation where rules for behavior are applied somewhat differentially. Here when the teacher applies rules for behavior he/she takes into account individual student characteristics such as age, ability, home background, etc. (Berlak & Berlak; Hammersley)

16. Allocation of School/Teacher Resources: Equal--Differential

On the one hand, some teachers take the position that all students deserve an equal share (in terms of both quantity and quality) of school resources such as teacher time, materials, and

knowledge. On the other hand, some teacher's hold the view that some individual students or groups of students merit a greater share of resources than others. This element addresses the question of distributive justice in the classroom. (Berlak & Berlak)

17. Common Culture--Subgroup Consciousness

A common culture emphasis indicates a desire to develop in children a common set of values, norms, and social definitions. On the other hand, a subgroup consciousness emphasis indicates a desire to foster in children a greater awareness of themselves as a member of some subgroup distinguished from others by such factors as language, race, ethnicity, etc. (Berlak & Berlak)